REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed June 15, 2004. Claims 1-28 were rejected. Applicant has submitted amendments for claims 1, 2, 8, 9-11, 18, 19, 26-28. Claims 1-28 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Microsoft Excel 2000 (pp. 1-11, copyright 1985-1999), hereinafter "Excel 2000." Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in light of the following remarks.

In regard to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Excel 2000 does not teach or suggest "wherein the first set of operation fields are displayed in columnar format on the display screen alongside the first plurality of number fields in the first column." Excel 2000 discloses a standard spreadsheet having multiple columns (e.g., A, B, C, etc.) and multiple rows (e.g., 1, 2, 3, etc.). In a standard spreadsheet such as Excel 2000, the intersection of a row and a column is referred to as a field or a cell. Each column in Excel 2000 includes a set of fields, one on top of another. Excel 2000 does not teach or suggest two types of fields, such as operation fields and number fields, being displayed alongside one another in the same column. In the Excel 2000 example screenshots cited by the Office Action, the set of operation fields is displayed below, not alongside, the set of number fields (e.g., in columns C and F). For similar reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Excel 2000 does not teach or suggest "wherein the second set of operation fields are displayed in columnar format on the display screen alongside the second plurality of number fields in the second column."

In regard to claim 9, Applicant respectfully submits that Excel 2000 does not teach or suggest "wherein the first column label substantially spans at least a combined width of the first plurality of number fields and the first set of one or more operation fields." In a standard spreadsheet such as Excel 2000, each column (e.g., A, B, C, etc.) has its own label which is displayed atop the column. As shown in the example Excel 2000 screenshots, a column label in a standard spreadsheet is typically the width of the

default size of a <u>single field</u> in the column. Excel 2000 does not teach or suggest that column labels (e.g., 'A,' 'B,' 'C,' etc.) may substantially span the <u>combined width</u> of two fields. For similar reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Excel 2000 does not teach or suggest "wherein the second column label substantially spans at least a combined width of the second plurality of number fields and the second set of one or more operation fields."

In regard to claim 10, Applicant respectfully submits that Excel 2000 does not teach or suggest "wherein a first field label is displayed atop the first plurality of number fields and below the first column label; wherein a second field label is displayed atop the first set of one or more operation fields, alongside the first field label, and below the first column label." In a standard spreadsheet such as Excel 2000, each column (e.g., A, B, C, etc.) has its own label which is displayed atop the column. However, Excel 2000 does not teach or suggest <u>two field labels</u> displayed <u>alongside one another</u> and <u>below a single column label</u>. For similar reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Excel 2000 does not teach or suggest "wherein a third field label is displayed atop the second plurality of number fields and below the second column label; and wherein a fourth field label is displayed atop the second set of one or more operation fields, alongside the third field label, and below the second column label."

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits that claims 1-28 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §102(b) rejections.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5676-00100/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

☒ Notice of Change of Address

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: August 31, 2004